

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

In the claims

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to clarify the setting of a plurality of keys on a keypad of the portable electronic device as a plurality of game keys and a game interrupt key of a program installed in the computer. This amendment is supported at lines 15-16 of page 3, lines 26-27 of page 4, lines 13-18 of page 6, and Figs. 1-3 of the original specification.

Also, claim 1 is amended to include steps of reading a pressing signal and determining a source of the pressing signal issued by a functional key of the keys, determining whether the functional key has been set as one of the game keys and game interrupt key, and sending a data package associated with the pressing signal to the computer. Support for these additional steps is found in the original claims, and claim 3 in particular, and at page 5 and Figs. 1-3 of the original specification.

Rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Myers (“Using Handhelds and PCs Together,” 2001). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Myers fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Myers fails to disclose or suggest initializing the communication interface and sending a joystick ID to the computer. While the examiner asserts that a “joystick ID must be sent such that the computer may accept output from the PDA in order to control functions on the computer,” Myers provides no such teaching or suggestion.

On the contrary, the passage of Myers cited by the examiner makes no reference at all to a joystick, and therefore can provide no teaching or suggestion for sending a joystick

ID to the computer. Myers makes no teaching or suggestion that any ID is required or that any ID must be sent by the PDA to the computer.

The passage of Myers cited by the examiner notes two examples of a PDA working in conjunction with a computer. Myers notes “a user’s laptop displays a PowerPoint presentation, but the user’s PDA controls the presentation,” and “the PDA communicates to the laptop through a serial cable or wirelessly.” (Myers; page 36, col. 1). Further, Myers describes another example of “scrolling desktop windows using the PDA in the user’s left hand while the mouse is in the user’s right hand.”

Neither example makes any reference to, or suggestion of, a joystick. Moreover, Myers does not describe any method for achieving these examples cited.

Myers fails to disclose or suggest setting a plurality of keys on a keypad of the portable electronic device as a plurality of game keys and a game interrupt key of a program installed in the computer. While the examiner opines that “an interrupt function must also be implemented such that the computer and the PDA can disconnect safely,” Myers provides no such teaching or suggestion.

Myers provides no teaching or suggestion that “an interrupt function must also be implemented.” Moreover, even assuming, *arguendo*, that this statement is correct, it does not follow that implementing an interrupt function includes setting a key on a keypad of the portable electronic device as a game interrupt key.

Myers makes no teaching or suggestion of such an interrupt function, or of any requirement that any such interrupt be performed by the PDA. Disconnect of the PDA from the computer could be initiated by the computer itself, by simply physically disconnecting the PDA from a communication means, by powering the PDA off, or by other means not requiring a game interrupt key.

Therefore, not only does Myers fail to disclose or suggest this claim element, even the examiner’s assertion does not lead to the claimed invention.

Myers fails to teach determining whether the portable electronic device is connecting to the computer under one of the other predetermined connecting modes, and

terminating the current connecting mode if the determination is positive. The examiner acknowledges this, but asserts that “it is old and well known in the art that these events need to take place for the device to change the function of the device and how the computer perceives the device.” However, the examiner has not cited any reference or other evidence to support this assertion.

Myers does not disclose or suggest simulating the portable electronic device as an associated joystick of the computer. Myers provides no teaching or suggestion at all of a joystick, or of using a PDA to simulate a joystick. At best, Myers discusses functionality such as controlling a PowerPoint presentation or scrolling windows. It must be noted that Myers does not disclose or suggest any method for accomplishing these tasks. There is no teaching or suggestion that these tasks relate to a joystick, rather than functions of simple cursor up/down keys, mouse functions, or a simple button click.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Myers fails to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 1 or of claims 6-10. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Further, with regard to claim 1, Myers fails to disclose or suggest reading a pressing signal and determining the source of the pressing signal issued by a functional key of the keys, determining whether the functional key has been set as one of the game keys and game interrupt key, and sending a package associated with the pressing signal to the computer. The examiner acknowledges this, but asserts that “one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have seen the benefit of implementing the pressing of keys this way to provide the user with a method to send commands and to make sure that the first command is sent before a second one is sent.”

Myers fails to disclose or suggest nearly all of the elements set forth in claim 1, and many of those of claim 6. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10 are allowable over the cited reference, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1 and 6-10 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: April 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921